

August 26, 2004
WSTL Advisory Committee Minutes

Meeting Minutes will be approved on September 2, 2004

Committee members present: Steve Lorch, Marshall Friedman, Richard Marriott, Tyler Tourville, Sheila Bowen, Jeff Gilman, Gary Hall, Marty Zeller, Lisa Horowitz, Donna Maddux

DNRC Non-committee Members Present: Greg Poncin, 3 members of the public.

Arriving late: Alan Elm

1. Subareas

Meeting opened with a discussion of the plan concepts put together by Marty. Steve Lorch suggested reviewing the minutes until more committee members show up. Several minor changes were made. Unanimous motion passed to adopt the minutes of August 19.

Marty stated that these summaries were only to document where we are at this moment in time, and that the subareas will be more fully flushed out at the 2 day session.

Happy Valley: what is meant by “some time in the future”? Transportation should be added to the list of issues. Richard asked if the time frame meant between 10 and 25 years. Lisa commented that it should mean at such time as a party comes forward to propose the improvements needed. Greg Poncin suggested that timing should be tied to an opportunity when it presents itself. Gary Hall suggested taking out the phrase “at some point in the future:”. Marty: these subareas will be more fully flushed out at the 2 day session in September.

KM: ok as written for now.

Swift Creek: small discussion, but OK as written for now.

Spencer Mountain: Marty summarized his write-up. Jeff Gilman concurred. Steve L clarified whether lease or disposal is meant. The group agreed to wait until this agenda item is discussed at 2 day meeting. Richard Marriott likes the approach on Spencer now.

Beaver Lake: ok as written for now.

Stillwater: clarifications as to which pod area was included in the motions. Marty will clarify.

Haskill: Marshall is under the impression that these two subareas have not really been decided on. Marty suggested we wait on the subareas for now, as it hard to do good planning without the maps and face-to-face interaction.

2. Community Preference

Marty summarized the written description of community preference. Marshall suggested that the idea of other revenue generation ideas should be considered. Greg P. stated that DNRC would like a 10 year time window for the closest in lands, and that deferred lands could be revisited by concurrence from DNRC, the City and the County at a date sooner than the 10 year window. Example of conservation easement. Jeff thought that conservation easement was always on the table. Question from Sheila as to whether the "terms" for a conservation buyer is the same across the board. Marty answered yes. Marshall stated he would concur with a conservation easement not a conservation buyer, or some term that does not allow for a house. Gary Hall stated that it is a matter of language in the plan. Donna asked if a conservation buyer would be required to allow public access. Mary states absolutely, it is a pre-condition. Marshall stated that we voted on this, and is concerned that it means a house. Sheila would like to be able to re-visit the votes on all the subareas involving lease or no transfer of title.

Discussion on time frame: Steve reports that Eric M says that he plans are typically 20 year plans, but that the group should come up with their own time line. Discussion as to whether the close in parcel should have the longer time window and the outer parcels the 10- year window. Discussion on predictability of the Plan versus time needed by the community to enact protection. Conclusion to wait until the two day session to try and identify a time frame for each subarea somewhere between 10 and 25 years.

Discussion of handout from Steve and Jeff's meeting regarding traditional uses. Except for pieces set aside by the committee as developable areas, Steve and Jeff suggest that all lands remain in their current DNRC timber classification. For clarification, classification does not change until the land is developed. Those areas will be developed then changed. is proposed until such time as development is proposed. (Cabin sites and grazing uses are in a separate category, but are a small part of the land area). Steve believes the DNRC classification will be secondary to the Neighborhood Plan, this information is more for background. General and special recreational uses would be compatible with the current classifications in most cases.

Group agrees to go until 7:30.

Discussion of the format and dates for Sept 9 and 10 relative to when the public meeting should be held. Conclusion to start at noon, do the subareas first and discuss revenue generation on Friday. Marty will prepare a draft agenda.

Budget: Not included preparing the Plan (production). No lunch on Thursday but snacks throughout the day and dinner for the evening. Lisa, Steve and Greg think that the DNRC can cover plan production costs.

Greg: Land Board will be looking at the Plan at the November 15th meeting. We should work backwards from that date for briefings, etc. Extra time can be used for peer review. After Sept 10th: concurrence on plan elements, A Draft Plan can be produced in 2 weeks. By September 30th everyone can bring back comments. Peer review can occur in early October.

Meeting Adjourned

